

1 Meryl Macklin (CA State Bar No. 115053)
2 *meryl.macklin@bryancave.com*
3 Daniel T. Rockey (CA State Bar No. 178604)
4 *daniel.rockey@bryancave.com*
5 BRYAN CAVE LLP
6 560 MISSION Street, 25th Floor
7 San Francisco, CA 94105-2994
8 Telephone: (415) 268-2000
9 Facsimile: (415) 268-1999

10 Attorneys for Defendants:
11 MISSION SAN JOSE AIRPORT, LLC and MISSION YOGURT, INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 AREAS USA SJC, LLC, a California limited
15 liability company,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 MISSION SAN JOSE AIRPORT, LLC, a
19 Colorado limited liability company, and
20 MISSION YOGURT, INC., a Colorado
21 corporation,

22 Defendants.

CASE NO. CV11-04487 HRL

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED VOIR DIRE
QUESTIONS AND VERDICT FORM**

PLACE: Courtroom 2

JUDGE: Hon. Howard R. Lloyd

Complaint Filed: September 9, 2011

Trial Date: January 7, 2013

1 Defendants Mission San Jose Airport, LLC and Mission Yogurt, Inc. (collectively,
2 "Defendants" or "Mission") set forth herein their objections the voir dire questions and verdict form
3 proposed by Plaintiff Areas USA SJC, LLC ("Areas"). The parties have conferred on these
4 objections. The below represents those on which there is continued disagreement.

5 I. VOIR DIRE QUESTIONS

6 Mission objects to Areas' proposed *voir dire* questions 6, 7 and 9, on the grounds that they
7 are argumentative and constitute an improper attempt to "condition" the jury in Areas' favor. These
8 questions suggest the arguments that Areas intends to make at trial on its behalf and are an improper
9 attempt to condition the jury against Mission's position, which is that either (1) Areas' actions mean
10 that no contract was formed or (2) Areas' actions mean that Mission's refusal to pay rent under the
11 contract was justified.

12 II. VERDICT FORM

13 Mission objects to Plaintiff Areas USA SJC, LLC's Proposed Form of Verdict for Trial
14 ("Proposed Verdict Form") as follows:

15 First, Areas' Proposed Verdict Form includes a lengthy preamble, suggesting that Mission
16 has stipulated to liability and that all that remains for decision is damages. That is not true. Mission
17 has agreed to certain facts, but has not stipulated to liability. Further, Mission has substantial
18 defenses both to contract formation and to liability, and Areas' Proposed Verdict Form ignores those
19 defenses.

20 Second, Areas' Proposed Verdict Form includes a statement of the burden of proof, which
21 Mission believes is unnecessary, as the jury will already have been instructed on the applicable
22 burdens of proof.

23 Third, Areas has misstated the standard for proving intentional misrepresentation or
24 concealment. Both can be proved by proving reckless disregard for the truth. Further, the CACI
25 instructions include reference to "reasonable reliance," not "justifiable reliance," which is what
26 Areas' Proposed Verdict Form includes. Using different terms in the instructions and the Verdict
27 Form risks confusing the jury. Also, Mission has stated a form of fraud equating to negligent
28

1 misrepresentation (under Civil Code Section 1572) and Areas' Proposed Verdict Form omits a
2 description of that claim as well.

3 Fourth, Mission has moved for leave to add affirmative defenses of unilateral and mutual
4 mistake. If granted, those defenses should be included in the final verdict form.

5 For all the above reasons, Mission respectfully requests that the Court use the Verdict Form
6 proposed by Mission and not the one proposed by Areas.

7
8 **III. CERTIFICATION**

9 I hereby certify that I have met and conferred with counsel prior to filing these objections in
10 accordance with the Court's Standing Order re: Pretrial Preparation.
11

12
13 Dated: December 11, 2012

BRYAN CAVE LLP

14
15 By: /s/ Daniel T. Rockey

16 Daniel T. Rockey

17 Attorneys for MISSION SAN JOSE AIRPORT,
18 LLC and MISSION YOGURT, INC.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28